Case 2:05-cv-00042-RSL Document 116 Filed 03/14/06 Page 1 of 7

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 54(B) OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE DOCSOC1:172447.1

26

GRAHAM & DUNN LLP Pier 70, 2801 Alaskan Way, Suite 300 Seattle, WA 98121-1128 Telephone: 206/624-8300

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b), Plaintiff Biomedino, LLC, and Co-Defendants Waters Technologies Corp., General Electric Company, and Agilent Technologies, Inc. ("the Parties"), jointly request that the Court enter final judgment of invalidity of claims 13-17 and 40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,602,502 ("the Patent-in-Suit") under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Under Rule 54, entry of judgment is appropriate because the Court's ORDER CONSTRUING CLAIMS OF THE '502 PATENT, filed November 22, 2005, ("ORDER") ultimately disposes of Biomedino's claims of patent infringement against all Defendants. This motion is unopposed and there is no just reason for delay.

II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The plaintiff, Biomedino, LLC ("Biomedino"), sued the Defendants for infringement of U.S. Patent No. 6,602,502. Following the Markman hearing, on November 22, 2005, the Court's claim construction ORDER found claims 13-17 and 40 to be indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 and, therefore, invalid. Specifically, the Court found that the claim term "control means," appearing in all of the claims-at-issue, is subject to 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6 and that the specification fails to adequately disclose a structure corresponding to the "control means" as required by the statute.

III. DISCUSSION

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54(b) ("Rule 54(b)"), when more than one claim for relief is presented in an action, the court may direct the entry of final judgment as to one or more but fewer than all of the claims "upon an express determination that there is no just reason for delay and upon an express direction for the entry of judgment." FRCP 54(b).

A. The Court's Order is a Final Judgment.

The Court's ORDER finding the claims-at-issue invalid is a judgment dispositive of the case because it ultimately disposes of Biomedino's claims of patent infringement against all the Defendants. See, e.g., Curtiss-Wright Corp. v. General Electric Co., 446 U.S. 1, 7 (citing Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. Mackey, 351 U.S. 427 (1956)) (judgment is final if ultimately disposes cognizable claim); see also, e.g., Trilogy Communications, Inc. v. Times Fiber Communications, Inc., 109 F.3d 739 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (Federal Circuit jurisdiction reviews District Court's claim construction and non-infringement judgment after certified judgment under Rule 54(b)).

B. No Just Reason for Delay of Entry of Judgment Exists.

To determine whether just reason exists to delay entry of final judgment, both judicial administrative interests and the equities of the present case are considered. *Curtis-Wright Corp.* 446 U.S. at 8. The present motion is unopposed and the disposition of all of the claims at issue under § 112 on the basis of the lack of definition of the "control means" limitation in the claims is readily separable from the other issues that may remain to be adjudicated. As such, the Federal Circuit would not be forced to decide any issue more than once, even in a subsequent appeal.

Either of a ruling of invalidity or a ruling of non-infringement support entry of judgment under Rule 54(b). The Federal Circuit has stated:

Once the district court decided that Gore's patent was invalid or that IMPRA did not infringe Gore's patent, the district court no longer needed to address any of the other defenses. The law is clear that a "defendant need only sustain one decisive defense, not all of them." *Baumstimler v. Rankin*, 677 F.2d 1061, 1070, 215 USPQ. 575, 582 (5th Cir. 1982). Because the infringement claim and several dispositive defenses were ruled upon, the district court's judgment was final.

W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Int'l Medical Prosthetics Research Associates, Inc., 975 F.2d 858, 863 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Thus, all the pertinent considerations weigh in favor of entering a final judgment of invalidity in favor of the Defendants.

IV. CONCLUSION 1 For the foregoing reasons, the Parties respectfully request that the Court enter the attached 2 judgment in favor of Defendants Waters Technologies Corp., General Electric Company, and Agilent 3 Technologies, Inc. that claims 13-17 and 40 of U.S. Patent No. 6,602,502 are invalid as indefinite 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. 5 Dated: March 14, 2006 6 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP 7 s/ Kurt T. Mulville James W. Geriak, Counsel Pro Hac Vice 8 Kurt T. Mulville, Counsel Pro Hac Vice 9 Joseph K. Liu, Counsel Pro Hac Vice Hardip B. Passananti, Counsel Pro Hac Vice ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP 10 4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600 Irvine, California 92614-2558 11 Telephone: (949) 567-6700 12 Facsimile: (949) 567-6710 s/ James L. Magee 13 James L. Magee 14 GRAHAM & DUNN Pier 70, 2801 Alaskan Way, Suite 300 Seattle, WA 98121-1128 15 Telephone: (206) 624-8300 Facsimile: (206) 340-9599 16 17 Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INCORPORATED 18 19 s/ Holly H. Barnes Robert B. Gould 20 Edward W. Goldstein LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT B. GOULD Holly H. Barnes Pacific Pointe Building Katherine L. Sunstrom 2110 North Pacific Street, Suite 100 21 GOLDSTEIN & FAUCETT, LLP Seattle, WA 98103-9126 1177 West Loop South, Suite 400 Telephon e: (206) 633-4442 22 Houston, TX 77027 Facsimile: (206) 633-4443 Telephone: (713) 877-1515 23 Facsimile: (713) 877-1145 24 Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterclaim-Defendant BIOMEDINO, LLC 25 26

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 54(B) OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE DOCSOC1:172447.1

GRAHAM & DUNN LLP Pier 70, 2801 Alaskan Way, Suite 300 Seattle, WA 98121-1128 Telephone: 206/624-8300

Case 2:05-cv-00042-RSL Document 116 Filed 03/14/06 Page 5 of 7

- 1		
1 2 3 4 5	s/ Aslan Baghdadi Lawrence J. Gotts Aslan Baghdadi June E. Cohan PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP 1650 Tysons Boulevard McLean, VA 22102-4859 Telephone: (703) 770-7900 Facsimile: (703) 770-7901	Helen B. Moure, WSBA# 26100 David A. Linehan, WSBA# 34281 PRESTON GATES & ELLIS 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900 Seattle, WA 98104-1158
6 7	Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff WATERS TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION	
8	s/ Wallace Wu Wallace Wu HOWREY LLP	Robert P. Taylor HOWREY LLP 1950 University Avenue
10	550 South Hope Street, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90071-2604 Telephone: (213) 892-1800 Facsimile: (213) 892-2300	Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: (650) 798-3555 Facsimile: (650) 400-6995
11 12 13 14	Mark D. Wegener Matthew M. Wolf HOWREY LLP 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20004-2407 Telephone: (202) 383-0800 Facsimile: (202) 383-6610 Attorneys for Defendant/Counterclaim-Plaintiff	
16 17	GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY d/b/a GENERAL ELECTRIC HEALTHCARE	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		

24

25

26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on March 15, 2006, I electronically filed the foregoing document 2 with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send electronic notification 3 of such filing to the following individuals: 4 Edward W. Goldstein 5 Holly H. Barnes 6 Katherine L. Sunstrom GOLDSTEIN & FAUCETT, LLP 7 1177 West Loop South, Suite 400 Houston, TX 77027 8 Telephone: 713/877-1515 Facsimile: 713/877-1145 egoldstein@gfiplaw.com hbarnes@gfiplaw.com 10 ksunstrom@fiplaw.com 11 Robert B. Gould LAW OFFICES OF ROBERT B. GOULD

12

Pacific Pointe Building

13 2110 North Pacific Street, Suite 100

Seattle, WA 98103-9126 14

- Telephone: 206/633-4442
- Facsimile: 206/633-4443 15 rbgould@nwlegalmal.com
- 16 Lawrence J. Gotts
- Aslan Baghdadi 17

1

- June E. Cohan
- PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP 18 1650 Tysons Boulevard
- McLean, VA 22102-4859 19
- Telephone: 703/770-7900
- 20 Facsimile: 703/770-7901
- lawrence.gotts@shawpittman.com 21 aslan.baghdadi@shawpittman.com
- june.cohan@shawpittman.com 22
- 23 Helen B. Moure, WSBA# 261001 David A. Linehan, WSBA# 34281
- PRESTON GATES & ELLIS 24
- 925 Fourth Avenue, Suite 2900
- Seattle, WA 98104-1158 25 HelenM@prestongates.com
- 26 DLinehan@prestongates.com

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 54(B) OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE DOCSOC1:172447.1

Case 2:05-cv-00042-RSL Document 116 Filed 03/14/06 Page 7 of 7

l II		
1	Wallace Wu HOWREY LLP	
2	550 South Hope Street, Suite 1400	
3	Los Angeles, CA 90071-2604 Telephone: 213/892-1800	
4	Facsimile: 213/892-2300 www@howrey.com	
5	Mark D. Wegener	
6	Matthew M. Wolf HOWREY LLP	
7	1299 Pennsylvania Avenue NW Washington, DC 20004-2407	
8	Telephone: 202/383-0800 Facsimile: 202/383-6610	
9	wegenerm@howrey.com wolfm@howrey.com	
10	Robert P. Taylor	
11	HOWREY LLP 1950 University Avenue	
12	Palo Alto, CA 94303 Telephone: 650/798-3555	
13	Facsimile: 650/400-6995 taylorr@howrey.com	
14		
14 15	_	
	_	Kurt T. Mulville
15	_	Kurt T. Mulville
15 16		Kurt T. Mulville
15 16 17		Kurt T. Mulville
15 16 17 18		Kurt T. Mulville
15 16 17 18		Kurt T. Mulville
15 16 17 18 19		Kurt T. Mulville
115 116 117 118 119 220 221		Kurt T. Mulville
115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222		Kurt T. Mulville
115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222 223		Kurt T. Mulville
115 116 117 118 119 220 221 222 223 224		Kurt T. Mulville

UNOPPOSED MOTION FOR ENTRY OF JUDGMENT UNDER RULE 54(B) OF THE FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE DOCSOC1:172447.1 GRAHAM & DUNN LLP Pier 70, 2801 Alaskan Way, Suite 300 Seattle, WA 98121-1128 Telephone: 206/624-8300